

**quinn emanuel trial lawyers | new york**

51 Madison Avenue, 22nd Floor, New York, New York 10010-1601 | TEL (212) 849-7000 FAX (212) 849-7100

August 23, 2013

**VIA ELECTRONIC MAIL**

The Honorable Denise L. Cote  
Daniel Patrick Moynihan  
United States Courthouse  
500 Pearl Street, Room 1610  
New York, NY 10007-1312

USDC SDNY  
DOCUMENT  
ELECTRONICALLY  
DATE 9/3/2013

WRITER'S DIRECT DIAL NO.  
(212) 849-7441

WRITER'S INTERNET ADDRESS  
manishasheth@quinnemanuel.com

*Redaction requests are granted*

*Denise Cote*  
*9/3/13*

FILED  
U.S. DISTRICT COURT  
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK  
SEP 3 2013

Re: FHFA v. JPMorgan Chase & Co. et al., 11 Civ. 6188 (DLC) (S.D.N.Y.)

Dear Judge Cote:

On behalf of Plaintiff Federal Housing Finance Agency ("FHFA"), we attach courtesy copies of (i) Plaintiff's Memorandum of Law in Opposition to Defendants' Motion for Severance; and (ii) the accompanying Declaration of Manisha M. Sheth in Support of Plaintiff's Memorandum of Law in Opposition to Defendants' Motion for Severance (the "Sheth Declaration") and accompanying exhibits.

Pursuant to Section 4.A of Your Honor's Individual Practices in Civil Cases, we request that (i) Exhibits 3, 4, and 6 be filed under seal and (ii) page 6 and footnote 13 to Plaintiff's Memorandum of Law be partially redacted. FHFA requests these redactions because: (i) Exhibits 3, 4, and 6 contain sensitive information that FHFA reasonably believes would result in commercial or financial harm to the GSEs; (ii) Page 6 cites to the sensitive information contained in Exhibit 3; and (iii) footnote 13 contains information relating to the fact that settlement discussions occurred pursuant to a sealed order from Judge Francis. Although we do not believe additional redactions are required, this letter provides Defendants with the opportunity to propose additional redactions to Plaintiff's Memorandum of Law and the Sheth Declaration with accompanying exhibits.

At the August 14, 2013 conference, the Court requested that FHFA inform it of FHFA's preferred order of trials in the event the Court ordered severance. Although FHFA believes that Defendants' motion should be denied in its entirety for the reasons set forth in Plaintiff's Memorandum of Law, if there is severance, the order should be as follows: (i) Bear Stearns, (ii) Washington Mutual ("WaMu"), and (iii) JPMorgan. This order would resolve the largest actions first: Bear Stearns has 38 securitizations, followed by WaMu with 35 securitizations, and then JPMorgan with 30 securitizations. In addition, JPMorgan will be a Defendant in the trial of the

**quinn emanuel urquhart & sullivan, llp**

LOS ANGELES | SAN FRANCISCO | SILICON VALLEY | CHICAGO | WASHINGTON, DC | LONDON | TOKYO | MANNHEIM | MOSCOW | HAMBURG | PARIS

Bear Stearns Defendants and the WaMu Defendants because of FHFA's successor liability claims. Accordingly, the resolution of either one of those cases at trial increases the likelihood that a trial on the JPMorgan Securitizations could be avoided through a global settlement. In contrast, trying the JPMorgan Securitizations first, as Defendants' propose, will do nothing to eliminate the need for a trial on the Bear Stearns or WaMu Securitizations.

Thank you for Your Honor's consideration of this submission.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Manisha Sheth".

Manisha M. Sheth

cc: Counsel of record (via e-mail)